

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, and 19 are amended, and claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 1, 3, 11, and 13 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 12, 16, 19, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. None of allowable claims 12, 16, 19, and 20 have been rewritten in independent form at this time. Instead, each of independent claims 1, 3, 11, and 13 has been amended to include a novel combination of elements not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner.

Foreign Priority

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicants' claim for foreign priority.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 2, 2004, and April 13, 2005, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copies of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith. Please note that

another IDS was filed on July 11, 2005. Acknowledgement is respectfully requested in the next official communication.

Drawings

The Examiner has not indicated whether or not the drawings have been accepted. Clarification is respectfully requested in the next official communication.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 12 have been amended in response to the Examiner's objection to these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification

Paragraph [00039] of the specification is revised merely to place it in better form and to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter is entered.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kano et al. (DE 19649602);

Claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hitoshi (JP 200322923A);

Claims 3, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Halvorson, Jr. (U.S. 1,394,896);

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kano et al. in view of Puente et al. (GB 2,254,686); and

Claims 4, 8, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halvorson, Jr. in view of Suzuki (U.S. 5,113,321).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 11

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 1 and 11 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a headlamp assembly including *inter alia*

a blindfold member is provided to fill a gap which is formed between said case and said reflector when viewed from the front side; and

a reflecting surface is formed on a front side of said blindfold member at an angle which is set so that light received from below is conducted in a forward of direction with respect the vehicle.

Support for these novel features can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [00039], and seen in FIGS. 1 and 8. According to the present invention, the reflecting surface is formed on a front side of the blind member at an angle which is set as to conduct light

in a direction forward of the vehicle. Accordingly, with a special member, when someone views the headlight from the front of the body, the blind member appears black.

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 11 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Kano et al. and Halvorson, Jr.

In contrast to the present invention, Kano et al. (DE 196 49 602) FIGS. 4, 5, and 6 merely disclose elements 46 having surfaces facing laterally and upwardly on element 91a. As can be seen from FIGS. 4, 5, and 6, the elements 46 of Kano et al. are only attached to an upper element 91a, and so that it is not possible to view light from below because the lower element 19b would block light from below. The surfaces 46 of Kano et al. are completely different from the reflecting surface of the blindfold member of claims 1 and 11 of the present invention. In addition, the reflector 12 of Halvorson, Jr. is not a blindfold member, as presently claimed.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 11 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Kano et al. and Halvorson, Jr. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claims 3 and 13

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent

claims 3 and 13 has been amended herein to recite a novel combination of elements directed to a headlamp assembly including *inter alia*

said blindfold member has a surface which is formed at such an angle so as to project light received from an inner surface of said case in a forward direction with respect to the vehicle.

Support for the novel features set forth in claims 3 and 13 can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [00039], and seen in FIG. 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 3 and 13 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Hitoshi and Halvorson, Jr.

In contrast to the present invention, Hitoshi (see FIG. 5) merely discloses an inner surface of the case 30 facing the back side of the reflector 38. In other words, the inner surface of the case 30 of Hitoshi is disposed in such a position such that it would be impossible for the blindfold member 39 to receive light from an inner surface of the case 30, and to project that light in a forward direction with respect to the vehicle.

Further, in contrast to the present invention, Halvorson, Jr. FIG. 1, merely discloses a case 10 having an inner surface behind reflector 12. In other words, the inner surface of the case 10 of Halvorson, Jr. is disposed in such a position such that it would be impossible for the reflector 12 to receive light from an inner surface of the case 10, and to project that light in a forward direction with respect to the vehicle.

The surfaces of Hitoshi and Halvorson, Jr. cited by the Examiner are completely different from the blindfold member of claims 3 and 13 of the present invention.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 3 and 13 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Hitoshi and Halvorson, Jr. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Therefore, claims 3 and 13 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 9 and 19 are amended.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/697,030
Amendment dated September 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2005


Docket No.: 0505-1253P
Art Unit 2875
Page 15 of 15 pages

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James M. Slattery
Registration No.: 28,380
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant